REMARKS

The claims pending in this case are claims 2 and 4-10.

In the above Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failure to show the feature recited in claim 8 of the reflective layer formed as a transflective layer and the backlight. The Examiner also rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for the reason that such feature is not described in the specification.

However, the transflective layer and the backlight are disclosed and explained in the description and the drawings of the present application in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art, as indicated below.

Figs. 17, 18, and 21 of the present application show a transflective layer 23 having openings 24, and Figs. 22, 23, and 24 show a transflective layer 25 formed from a very thin film.

Further, an explanation of the transflective layer is given on page 40, line 32 to page 41, line 8; on page 53, line 29 to page 54, line 2; and on page 57, line 28 to page 58, line 3 of the specification, in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art.

In the description of the application as filed, although there were some errors in drawing numbers relating to the explanation of the term "transflective layer," they were corrected in the Preliminary Amendment filed on October 31, 2001.

The corrections relating to the transflective layer are as follows:

- Figure 21 → Figure 22 (page 52, line 17);
- Figure T → Figure 23 (page 54, line 2);
- Figure 18 → Figure 23 (page 54, line 20);

- "transflective layer 9 nor the color filter 10"

  → "transflective layer 25 nor the color filter 26"

  (page 56, line 5);

- transflective layer 9 → transflective layer 25

  (page 56, line 12); and

- Figures 18, 23, 19 and 20 → Figures 23, 24, 19, and 20

  (page 58, line 37).

With respect to the backlight 16, Figs. 17, 21, 22, and 24, and the description (page 43, lines 22-26, page 54, lines 10-15) disclose it in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art.

Therefore, it is believed that any amendments of the drawings or claim 8 is not necessary and that claim 8 complies with the requirements of §112.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 2, 6/2, 7/2, 9/2, and 10/2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Shingo et al. (JP 11119215) in view of Ogawa et al. (U.S. 6,122,027 A) and Sato et al. (EP 000949515 A2). The indicated allowance of claim 4 and the claims dependent therefrom is appreciated. However, it is believed claim 2 and the claims dependent therefrom also define a patentable invention over the cited prior art.

Shingo et al. and Ogawa et al. may disclose the subject matter for which they are cited. However, in arguing that Sato et al. discloses the subject matter missing in Shingo et al. and Ogawa et al., the Examiner noted with reference to Fig. 3 that "Sato et al. teach (Figs. 2-4 and 10) forming a liquid crystal display with a straight-go transmittance of an anisotropic scattering layer 1-1 has an incident angle dependence

(from -60° to 60°) that is symmetrical about a layer normal to the anisotropic scattering layer for both the X-axis direction and the Y-axis direction (on surface of the anisotropic scattering layer as Fig. 3 shown), a maximum straight-go transmittance is substantially the same in value for both the X-axis direction and the Y-axis direction (the scattered light beams assume an elliptical shape as Fig. 4B shown) for realizing a large viewing angle, improving a brightness and displaying a clear image (col. 2, paragraphs 11-12)."

With respect to the anisotropic scattering layer (1-1) in Sato et al., its haze value is asymmetrical about a layer normal ($\theta = 0$), as shown in the graph of Fig. 3, exemplifying a relationship between the "INCIDENT ANGLE (θ)" of the incident light (4) and the "HAZE VALUE (%)" of the anisotropic scattering layer (1-1) (see column 8, lines 4-14 of Sato et al.).

Consequently, the straight-go transmittance of the anisotropic scattering layer (1-1) of Sato et al. is asymmetrical about the incident angle θ, because the straight-go transmittance increases as the haze value decreases as shown in the formulas on page 13, lines 3-6 of the specification.

On the other hand, according to claim 2, the straight-go transmittance of the anisotropic scattering layer has an incident angle dependence that is symmetrical about a layer normal to the anisotropic scattering layer for both X-axis direction and Y-axis direction.

Therefore, the incident angle dependence of the anisotropic scattering layer in Sato et al. is different from the one of claim 2, because the straight-go transmittance of the anisotropic scattering layer (1-1) in Sato et al. is asymmetrical while the one of claim 2 is symmetrical.

Fig. 4B in Sato et al. shows the light scattering properties of the light scattering film 1-1, i.e., it shows the distribution of the scattered light obtained by the film 1-1 (see paragraph [0042] of Sato et al.). However, it shows only the situation where the direction of the incident angle θ of the incident light 7 coincides with the direction of the layer normal to the film 1-1, as shown in Fig. 4A.

The light scattering properties of the light scattering film 1-1 are explained with reference to Fig. 3 when the direction of the incident angle of the incident light is oblique to the direction of the layer normal as shown in Fig. 1B or 2B. However, Sato et al. does not refer to the light scattering properties where the direction of the incident angle of the incident light is a direction oriented at a right angle to the direction shown in Figs. 1B and 2B.

Therefore, Sato et al. neither discloses nor suggests the requirement of claim 2 in which the straight-go transmittance of the anisotropic scattering layer has an incident angle dependence that is symmetrical about a layer normal to the anisotropic scattering layer for both the X-axis direction and the Y-axis direction.

Accordingly, it is not believed that claim 2 or any of the claims dependent therefrom are obvious in view of the cited combination of references, and its withdrawal as a ground of rejection of the claims is therefore requested.

It is believed all of claims 2 and 4-10 are in condition for allowance.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 14, 2005

By: _____
Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338

851910_1.DOC